CHICAGO JOURNALS

Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought by Kenneth C. Schellhase
Review by: Arnaldo Momigliano
Classical Philology, Vol. 74, No. 1 (Jan., 1979), pp. 72-74
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/268269
Accessed: 09/05/2014 14:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.85 on Fri, 9 May 2014 14:42:58 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

In a second edition—provided it deserves the name and is not a mechanical reprint—it should be easy to remove these few shadows from an otherwise splendid performance. To the numerous merits that have been pointed out one more should be added, the indexes. Both of them are reliable and very useful, and it was a wise decision to keep the *index auctorum* apart from the *index graecus*, which includes all proper names other than authors.

Friedrich Solmsen
University of North Carolina

Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought. By KENNETH C. SCHELLHASE. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1976. Pp. xiii + 270. $16.00

All the great Greek and Latin historians of antiquity were models for historians of later generations, but only Tacitus came to have wider significance for politicians, moralists, and religious leaders for about three centuries from the Reformation to the French Revolution. First, he gave the Germans that picture of German virtues and German leaders (Arminius) which decisively contributed to their self-confidence in their struggles with the Roman Church and with the *Welsch* nations. Secondly, he transmitted an ambiguous image of monarchy which (as Guicciardini observed) could both teach tyrants to secure their tyranny and teach those who live under tyrants to behave prudently. On the other hand he could easily be turned into a guide for active opponents of absolutism whenever and wherever (England, Holland, and later France) conditions became propitious for political reform. These developments of Tacitus' teaching are of course entirely modern, but they have their roots in his ambiguities and also in his almost prophetic foresight, because he was afraid of the Germans and looked anxiously out of the corner of his eye at Jews and Christians.

The story of the modern fortunes of Tacitus has been told several times since Giuseppe Toffanin—not without predecessors—wrote his classic book *Machiavelli e il "Tacitismo"* (Padua, 1921). In recent years research on "Tacitism" has multiplied and has been especially fruitful in the Spanish area. The Spanish studies by E. Tierno Galván ("El tacitismo en las doctrinas políticas del siglo de oro español," *Anales de la Universidad de Murcia*, 1948, pp. 895–988; reprinted in *Escritos (1950–1960)* [Madrid, 1971]), F. Sanmartí Boncompte (*Tácito en España* [Barcelona, 1951]), and J. A. Maravall (*La Philosophie politique espagnole au XVII^e siècle* [Paris, 1955]) have been accompanied by those of J. von Stackelberg on Tacitus in Italy and France (*Tacitus in der Romania* [Tübingen, 1960]) and of Else-Lilly Etter, more generally, on *Tacitus in der Geistesgeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Basel, 1966). In a chapter of twenty pages on "Tacitism" in the collective volume *Tacitus* edited by T. A. Dorey (London, 1969), P. Burke brilliantly characterized the main features of this phenomenon. In the same year André Stegmann produced an interesting programme for new research and evaluation, the developments of which, if they were published, are not known to me ("Le Tacitisme: Programme pour un nouvel essai de définition," *PPol* 2 [1969]: 445–58).

Professor K. C. Schellhase in his book goes over all the evidence again and attempts a synthesis. He does not aim at new discoveries, but shows on every

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.85 on Fri, 9 May 2014 14:42:58 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

page a remarkable command, if not of the original texts, at least of the modern literature: only the Spanish section is patently defective. The book is useful.

As the limits of the research are so clearly and honestly marked, critical observations must correspondingly be confined to the relation between the new book and previous research. It seems to me that S. is inclined to attribute too much importance to the early Florentine references to Tacitus. He consequently believes that Tacitus lost political importance when he was no longer interpreted in republican terms, as Leonardo Bruni had done in his *Laudatio florentinae reipublicae* about 1401–4. No doubt H. Baron discovered a very significant reference to Tacitus *Histories* 1. 1 in the text of the *Laudatio* of which he later became the first editor (*From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni* [Chicago, 1969]; the reference is on p. 247). But such a prominent use of a passage of Tacitus to describe the effects of the transition from a republican to a monarchic regime is somehow untypical of the fifteenth-century humanist: Bruni himself owed much more to Polybius than to Tacitus. The fact remains that Tacitus' reputation soared in the sixteenth century. As has long been recognized, it was not so much founded on a specific doctrine as on a mental attitude. During the Counter-Reformation, Tacitus was taken to express a pessimistic vision of political life, an ambiguous nostalgia for freedom which was at the same time an implicit (or explicit) recognition that true liberty, if it had ever existed, was out of reach. What is more, this attitude was not read into Tacitus by his sixteenth- and seventeenth-century readers. It was there, only waiting to be developed in various directions by the commentators. It explained politics and guided politics. I am therefore at a loss to understand why S. denies genuine political interests to Justus Lipsius (p. 134), and declares: "The tradition of the application of Tacitus to political reality, which had begun with Bruni in 1403, did not survive the death of Boccalini in 1613" (p. 150). In 1640 Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt declared in the dedication to Richelieu of his translation of Tacitus' books on Tiberius: "C'est luy [Tacite] qui a engendré toute la politique d'Espagne et d'Italie . . . c'est luy que les Princes de la Maison d'Autriche consultent encore tous les jours dans la nécessité de leurs affaires."

K. A. Blüher in his fine book *Seneca in Spanien* (Munich, 1969), which does not seem to have been used by S., has some very illuminating pages on the questions about Seneca which Tacitus suggested to his Spanish readers. Did Seneca behave with the prudence one is entitled to expect from the minister and confidant of a monarch? Did the Roman state derive advantage from Seneca's dissimulation? Such were the questions that the biographers of Seneca, Juan Francisco Fernandez de Heredia (1642) and Juan Baños de Velasco y Acebedo (1674), tried to answer—and very real (and political) questions they were, in an age in which a satisfactory relation between a monarch and his minister(s) was the first requirement of politics.

For England S. himself has to admit different chronological limits to political Tacitism (p. 157). But there is very little Tacitism in the controversy between the great scholar whom he calls "a certain Salmasius" (p. 164; the index takes the name for a pseudonym!) and Milton. As Salmasius and Milton were quarreling about the divine rights of kings, the Old Testament and St. Paul were more to the point than Tacitus. "Si fuit, cur Paulus de eo non intellexit? Cur praetermisit?" This is a fair example of Salmasius' way of arguing (*Ad Johannem Miltonum responsio, opus posthumum* [London, 1660], p. 303). It is interesting that Salmasius

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.85 on Fri, 9 May 2014 14:42:58 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

quotes Tacitus to lessen the ancient liberties of the Germans (*Defensio regia* [Leyden, 1649], p. 239). Milton used Tacitus with greater emphasis, and rather cheaply accused Salmasius of getting his Tacitus secondhand, but he too relied mainly on the Bible. It comes as another surprise to hear from S. that Jeremy Taylor in *The Rule of Conscience* (or *Ductor dubitantium*) "showed even greater skill in ransacking Tacitus to support the rightful rule of the King" (p. 165). If a book was ever ransacked by Jeremy Taylor, it was of course the Bible.

A careful reading of Milton, Salmasius, and Jeremy Taylor at least teaches us what Tacitus was not: a text to be used to settle questions about the divine rights of kings.

Arnaldo Momigliano
University of Chicago

Farm Equipment of the Roman World. By K. D. WHITE. Cambridge–London–New York–Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1975. Pp. xvii + 258 + 16 pls.; 66 figs. in text. $35.00.

This is a companion volume to the author's *Agricultural Implements of the Roman World* (Cambridge, 1967); with the earlier volume it shares its raison d'être, its methodology, and its presentation of data. White aims at the same wide audience: readers of Latin literature, scholars of ancient agriculture, lexicographers, and historians. The value of this work, as of the former, lies not so much in its peculiar usefulness for a certain category of student as in its pioneering attempt to set archaeological evidence alongside literary evidence. Since they are so much better acquainted with literature than most (I do not say all) literary specialists are with archaeology, I cannot say how useful these books will be to archaeologists. The information White has collected will surely interest large numbers of classicists and medievalists, not just the historians of technology. Shortcomings are inevitable, perhaps, in a pioneering study such as this; if I seem negative, it is in the hope that the book will be used to its best advantage, and I do not mean to underrate a very laudable achievement.

W. comes equipped as a historian, and in particular as the English-speaking world's specialist in Roman agriculture (see his *Roman Farming* [London, 1970]). He is not a philologist, nor does he pretend to be; he wants to help us all out of a muddled confusion to which editors and translators have generously contributed (p. xi). A hard-core philologist will find much to grumble about in W.'s superficial treatment of etymologies, spelling, and closely related words: e.g., *festuca*, *fistuca* (pp. 5 ff.)—what does Festus' *ferula* have to do with this implement, and do we not want Palladius' *fisticula* (5. 7. 2)? At best, superficial philological comments are irrelevant; at worst, they are misleading or erroneous (cf. my remark in "Notes on Palladius 1. 42," *BICS* 18 [1971]: 50, n. 6). W. is generally unhelpful on textual variants. Some which he gives do not require even passing attention in a work of this sort (e.g., Pliny *HN* 31. 27, discussed p. 184, n.—for the *pelvis* it would have been more to the point to compare *Geopon.* 2. 4. 2; or *Moretum* 62, discussed p. 25, n.). At other times we may wonder about the authenticity or the accuracy of an important word (e.g., *festucisque* in Caesar *BG* 4. 17. 4, mentioned p. 6, n., or *serias* in Varro *Rust.* 1. 55. 5, mentioned p. 185, n.). It is nice to have Mynors'

This content downloaded from 194.29.185.85 on Fri, 9 May 2014 14:42:58 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions